

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed 3/4/2004, Claims 14 -16 were rejected as being anticipated by the prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 10, and 11 were rejected as being obvious over the prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Claims 5-7 and 12-13 were objected to, but were further indicated as being allowable.

In response, Applicant has submitted the proposed amendments to independent claims 1, 8 and 14 to overcome the Examiner's objection. Applicant has further proposed amendment to Figure 6 to further clarify the scope of the claimed invention. Finally, Applicant has cancelled Claim 15.

For the reasons set forth below, reconsideration of the rejections is requested and allowance of the present application is submitted to be in order.

Patentability of Claims 1, 8 and 14 (as proposed amended)

Applicant and the Examiner conducted a telephone interview on 3/23/04 during which consensus was reached on at least one matter, i.e. that neither *Clarke* nor *Siems*, nor their combination, disclosed Applicant's claimed invention wherein the lamp or light was contained within the housing, the housing being separate from the "ball dome member." Applicant has proposed amendment to Figure 6 to further clarify this feature, and has further proposed amendment to the independent claims in a way that Applicant believes is consistent with the agreement reached between the Examiner and Applicant's attorney in the course of the telephone interview.

Applicant has reviewed the Examiner's Interview Summary and agrees with all statements made therein, with one minor exception. At line 6 (six) of the Examiner's continuation sheet, the Examiner represents that the undersigned agreed to including six threaded bores in an amendment to Claim 14; the undersigned respectfully understood that the agreement was to include 4 (four) threaded bores. Applicant has proposed amendment consistent with this understanding, and respectfully requests that the Examiner accept this amendment as being sufficient, as well as allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks and proposed amendments, Applicant respectfully requests that the application be reconsidered, the claims be allowed, and the case passed to issue. If any impediment to the allowance of the claims remains after consideration of this request for reconsideration, and such impediment could be alleviated during a telephone interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

STEINS & ASSOCIATES

Karl M. Steins
Registration No. 40,186
2333 Camino del Rio South
Suite 120
San Diego, California 92108
Telephone: (619) 692-2004
Facsimile: (619) 692-2003